



XLIV. Elementary researches in the analysis of combinatorial aggregation

J.J. Sylvester Esq. A.M. F.R.S.

To cite this article: J.J. Sylvester Esq. A.M. F.R.S. (1844) XLIV. Elementary researches in the analysis of combinatorial aggregation , Philosophical Magazine Series 3, 24:159, 285-296, DOI: [10.1080/14786444408644856](https://doi.org/10.1080/14786444408644856)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14786444408644856>



Published online: 30 Apr 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 4



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)

Formerly I often wished to be personally acquainted with Dr. Barry, in order to reconcile our discordant opinions by a reference to conjoint observations, but now his fancy has so completely got the better of his judgement, and the manner in which he has treated me is so personal and unworthy, that I altogether despair of coming to any understanding with him. I see well that time must decide between him and me, and this, on account of the difficulty of the object, may yet be long in coming about.

TH. BISCHOFF, M.D.,
Professor of Physiology.

Giessen, Feb. 10, 1844.

XLIV. *Elementary Researches in the Analysis of Combinatorial Aggregation.* By J. J. SYLVESTER, Esq., A.M., F.R.S.*

THE ensuing inquiries will be found to relate to combination-systems, that is, to combinations viewed in an aggregative capacity, whose species being given, we shall have to discover rules for ranging or evolving them in classes amenable to certain prescribed conditions. The question of numerical amount will only appear incidentally, and never be made the primary object of investigation †.

The number of things combined will be termed the modulus of the system to which they belong. The elements taken singly, or combined in twos, threes, &c., will be denominated accordingly the monadic, duadic, triadic elements, or simply the monads, duads, or triads of the system.

Let us agree to denote by the word *synthème* ‡ any aggregate of combinations in which all the monads of a given system appear once, and once only.

It is manifest that many such *synthèmes* totally diverse in every term may be obtained for a given system to any modulus, and for any order of combination.

Let us begin with considering the case of duad *synthèmes*. Take the modulus 4 and call the elements a, b, c, d .

($a . b . c . d$), ($a . c . b . d$), ($a . d . c . b$) constitute three perfectly independent *synthèmes*, and these three *synthèmes* include between them all the duad elements, so that no more inde-

* Communicated by the Author.

† The present theory may be considered as belonging to a part of mathematics which bears to the combinatorial analysis much the same relation as the geometry of position to that of measure, or the theory of numbers to computative arithmetic; number, place, and combination (as it seems to the author of this paper) being the three intersecting but distinct spheres of thought to which all mathematical ideas admit of being referred.

‡ From $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ and $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\alpha$.

pendent syntheses can be obtained from them. Again, let a, b, c, d, e, f be the monads; we can write down five independent syntheses, to wit,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} a. b c. d e. f \\ a. d c. f e. b \\ a. c d. e f. b \\ a. f b. d c. e \\ a. e d. f b. c \end{array} \right\}$$

We can write no more than these without repeating duads which have already appeared*.

We propose to ourselves this problem:—*A system to any even† modulus being given to arrange the whole of its duads‡ in the form of syntheses; or in other words, to evolve a Total of duad syntheses to any given even modulus§.*

When the modulus is odd, as before remarked, the formation of a duad synthesis is of course impossible, for any number of duads must necessarily contain an even number of monadic elements; but there is nothing to prevent us from forming in *all* cases what may be termed a bisynthesis or diplotheme, *i. e.* an aggregate of combinations, where each element occurs twice and no more.

* Such an *aggregate* of syntheses may be therefore termed a Total.

† The modulus must be even, as otherwise it is manifest no single synthesis can be formed. We shall before long extend the scope of our inquiry so as to take in the case of odd moduli.

‡ Triadic systems will be treated of hereafter.

§ It is scarcely necessary to advert here to the fact of the problem being in general indeterminate and admitting of a great variety of solutions.

When the modulus is four there is only one systematic arrangement possible, and there is no indeterminateness of any kind; from this we can infer, *a priori*, the reducibility of a biquadratic equation; for using φ, f, F to denote rational symmetrical forms of function, it follows that

$$F \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f(\varphi a, b, \varphi c, d) \\ f(\varphi a, c, \varphi b, d) \\ f(\varphi a, d, \varphi b, c) \end{array} \right\} \text{ is itself a rational symmetric function of } a, b, c, d.$$

Whence it follows that if a, b, c, d be the roots of a biquadratic equation, $f(\varphi a, b, \varphi c, d)$ can be found by the solution of a cubic: for instance, $(a+b) \times (c+d)$ can be thus determined, whence immediately the sum of any two of the roots comes out from a quadratic equation.

To the modulus 6 there are fifteen different syntheses capable of being constructed; at first sight it might be supposed that these could be classed in natural families of three or of five each, on which supposition the equation of the sixth degree could be depressed; but on inquiry this hope will prove to be futile, not but what natural affinities do exist between the totals; but in order to separate them into families each will have to be taken twice over, or in other words, the fifteen syntheses to modulus 6 being reduplicated subdivide into six natural families of five each. Again, it is true that the triads to modulus 6 (just like the duads to modulus 4) admit of being thrown into but one systematic total, but then this will contain ten syntheses, a number greater than the modulus itself.

For instance, if the elements be called after the letters of the alphabet, we have $(\begin{smallmatrix} a. b b. c c. d d. e e. a \\ a. c c. e e. b b. d d. a \end{smallmatrix})$, the bisynthetic total to modulus 5; and in like manner

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} a. b b. c c. d d. e e. f f. g g. a \\ a. c c. e e. g g. b b. d d. f f. a \\ a. d d. g g. c c. f f. b b. e e. a \end{array} \right\} \text{the total to modulus 7.}$$

In general, if n be the modulus, the number of duads is $n \cdot \frac{n-1}{2}$; n being even, $\frac{n}{2}$ duads go to each syntheme, and therefore the total contains $(n-1)$ of these. If (n) be odd, then, since always n duads go to a bisyntheme, the number of such in the total is $\frac{n-1}{2}$.

Before proceeding to the solution of the problem first proposed, let us investigate the theory of diplothetic arrangement. Here we shall find another term convenient to employ. By a Cyclotheme, I designate a fixed arrangement of the elements in one or more circles, in which, although for typographical purposes they are written out in a straight line, the last term is to be viewed as contiguous and antecedent to the first; the recurrence may be denoted by laying a dot upon the two opened ends of the circle; $\dot{a}.b.c.d.e$ will thus denote a cyclotheme to modulus 5; $\dot{a}.b.c.d.e.f.g.h.k$ the same to modulus 9; so also is $\dot{a}.b.\dot{c}, \dot{d}.e.\dot{f}, \dot{g}.h.\dot{k}$ a cyclotheme of another species to the same modulus. In general the number of terms will be alike in each division of a cyclotheme.

Now it is evident that every cyclotheme, on taking together the elements that lie in conjunction, may be developed into a diplotheme. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{1}.2.\dot{3} &= 1.2\ 2.3\ 3.1 \\ \dot{1}.2.3.\dot{4} &= 1.2\ 2.3\ 3.4\ 4.1, \\ (\dot{1}.2.\dot{3}; \dot{4}.5.\dot{6}; \dot{7}.8.\dot{9}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1.2\ 2.3\ 3.1 \\ 4.5\ 5.6\ 6.4 \\ 7.8\ 8.9\ 9.7 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we shall derive a rule for throwing the duads of any system into bisynthemes.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Let } m = 3, \text{ we have simply } \dot{a}b\dot{c} \\ m = 5, \text{ we write } \dot{a}.b.c.d.\dot{e} \\ \dot{a}.c.e.b.\dot{d} \end{aligned}$$

The second being derived from the first by omitting every alternate term; similarly, below the lines are derived each from its antecedent.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 m = 7, \text{ we have } \dot{a} . \dot{b} . \dot{c} . \dot{d} . \dot{e} . \dot{f} . \dot{g} \\
 \dot{a} . \dot{c} . \dot{e} . \dot{g} . \dot{b} . \dot{d} . \dot{f} \\
 \dot{a} . \dot{e} . \dot{b} . \dot{f} . \dot{c} . \dot{g} . \dot{d}
 \end{array}$$

A very little consideration will serve to prove that in this way, m being a *prime number*, $\frac{m-1}{2}$, cyclothemes may be formed, such that no element will ever be found more than once in contact on either side with any other; whence the rule for obtaining the diptothematic total to any prime-number modulus is apparent.

Ex. gr. to modulus 7 the total reads thus:—

$$\left. \begin{array}{l}
 \text{1st. } a . b \ b . c \ c . d \ d . e \ e . f \ f . g \ g . a \\
 \text{2nd. } a . c \ c . e \ e . g \ g . b \ b . d \ d . f \ f . a \\
 \text{3rd. } a . e \ e . b \ b . f \ f . c \ c . g \ g . d \ d . a
 \end{array} \right\}$$

and no more remains to be said on this special case.

Let us now return to the theory of even moduli, and show how to apply what has been just done to constructing a synthematic total to a modulus which is the double of a prime number.

Suppose the modulus to be six, the number of synthemes is five. Let the six elements, a, b, c, d, e, f , be taken in three parts, so that each part contains two of them; let these parts be called A, B, C, where A denotes ab , B, cd , and C, ef .

Now the duads will evidently admit of a distinction into two classes, those that lie in one part, and those that lie between two; thus ab, cd, ef will be each *unipartite* duads, the rest will be *bipartite*.

The unipartite duads may be conveniently formed into a syntheme by themselves; it only remains to form the four remaining bipartite duad synthemes.

Write the parts in cyclothematic order, as below:

A B C.

It will be observed that each part may be written in two positions; thus

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{A may be expressed by } \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \end{array} \text{ or by } \begin{array}{c} b \\ a \end{array} \\
 \text{B} \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \begin{array}{c} c \\ d \end{array} \quad \dots \quad \begin{array}{c} d \\ c \end{array} \\
 \text{C} \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \begin{array}{c} e \\ f \end{array} \quad \dots \quad \begin{array}{c} f \\ e \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Now we may form a cyclic table of positions as below :

A	B	C
1	1	1
1	2	2
2	1	2
2	2	1

Here the numbers in each horizontal line denote the synchronous positions of the parts.

On inspection it will be discovered that A will be found in each of its two positions, with B in each of its two; similarly B with C, and C with A. In fact the four permutations, 1. 1 1. 2 2. 1 2. 2, occur, though in different orders, in any two assigned vertical columns.

Now developpe the preceding table, and we have

a	c	e	a	d	f	b	c	f	b	d	e
b	d	f	b	c	e	a	d	e	a	c	f

and these being read off (the superior of each antecedent with the inferior of each consequent*) must manifestly give the four independent bipartite synthememes which we were in quest of, *videlicet*

(a. d c. f e. b), (a. c d. e f. b), (b. d c. e f. a), (b. c d. f e. a); these four, together with the synthemem first described (a. b c. d e. f), constitute a duad synthemematic total to modulus 6.

Before proceeding further let us take occasion to remark that the foregoing table of positions may evidently be extended to any odd number of terms by repetition of the second and third places, as seen in the annexed tables of position.

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1

Now let 10 be the modulus.

As before divide the elements into five parts, which call A, B, C, D, E.

The unipartite duads fall into a single synthememe; the eight remaining bipartite synthememes may be found as follows :—

* Any other *fixed* order of successive conjunction would answer equally well.

† It will not fail to be borne in mind that in operating with these tables only *contiguous* elements are taken in conjunction : the first with the second, the second with the third, the third with the fourth, &c., and the last with the first; no two terms but such as lie together are in any manner conjugated with one another.

Arrange in cyclothemes ($\frac{n-1}{2}$ in number) the odd modulus system A, B, C, D, E. We have thus

$$\begin{array}{c} \dot{A} B C D E \\ \dot{A} C E B \dot{D}. \end{array}$$

Let each cyclotheme be taken in the four positions given in the table above, we have thus 2×4 , *i. e.* eight arguments.

$$\begin{array}{l} a b c d e . \dot{a} \beta \gamma \delta \dot{\epsilon} . \dot{a} b \gamma d \dot{\epsilon} . \dot{a} \beta c d \dot{\epsilon} \\ \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \dot{\epsilon} , a b c d e , a \beta c d \dot{\epsilon} , a b \gamma d \dot{\epsilon} \\ a c e b \dot{d} . \dot{a} \gamma \epsilon \beta \dot{\delta} . \dot{a} \gamma \epsilon b \dot{d} . \dot{a} c e \beta \dot{\delta} \\ \alpha \gamma \epsilon \beta \dot{\delta} , a c e b \dot{d} , a c e \beta \dot{\delta} , a \gamma \epsilon b \dot{d} \end{array}$$

And each of these arguments will furnish one bipartite syntheme, by reading off, as before, the *superior* of each antecedent with the *inferior* of each consequent; and the least reflection will serve to show that the same duad can never appear in two distinct arguments.

In like manner, if the modulus be 14 and seven parts be taken, the bipartite syntheses, twelve in number, may be expressed symbolically thus:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{1} . \dot{1} . \dot{1} . \dot{1} . \dot{1} . \dot{1} . \dot{1} \\ + \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} \\ + \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} \\ + \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} \end{array} \right\} \times \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{A} . \dot{B} . \dot{C} . \dot{D} . \dot{E} . \dot{F} . \dot{G} \\ + \dot{A} . \dot{C} . \dot{E} . \dot{G} . \dot{B} . \dot{D} . \dot{F} \\ + \dot{A} . \dot{E} . \dot{B} . \dot{F} . \dot{C} . \dot{G} . \dot{D} \end{array} \right\}$$

Nay more, from the above table, if we agree to name the elements $A_1 B_1$, $A_2 B_2$, &c., we can at once proceed to calculate each of the twelve syntheses in question by an easy algorithm. For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2} . \dot{2}) \times (\dot{A} . \dot{C} . \dot{E} . \dot{G} . \dot{B} . \dot{D} . \dot{F}) \\ & = (A_1 . C_1 C_2 . E_1 E_2 . G_1 G_2 . B_1 B_2 . D_1 D_2 . F_1 F_2 . A_2). \end{aligned}$$

And again,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2} . \dot{1} . \dot{2}) \times (\dot{A} . \dot{E} . \dot{B} . \dot{F} . \dot{C} . \dot{G} . \dot{D}) \\ & = A_2 . E_2 E_1 . B_1 B_2 . F_2 F_1 . C_1 C_2 . G_2 G_1 . D_1 D_2 . A_1; \end{aligned}$$

each figure occurring once unchanged as an antecedent and once changed as a consequent.

If it were thought worth while it would not be difficult, by using numbers instead of letters, to obtain a general analytical formula, from which all similarly constituted syntheses to any modulus might be evolved.

But the rule of proceeding must be now sufficiently obvious; the modulus being $2p$, we divide the elements into p classes; these may be arranged into $\frac{p-1}{2}$ distinct forms of cyclothetic arrangement, and each of the cyclothemes taken in four positions, thus giving $4 \times \frac{p-1}{2}$, *i. e.* $2p - 2$ bipartite synthemes, the whole number that can be formed to the given modulus $2p$.

I shall now proceed to the theory of bipartite synthemes to the modulus $2m \times p$, by which it is to be understood that we have p , parts each containing $2m$ terms, and p is at present supposed to be a prime number; the total number of synthemes to the modulus $2mp$ being $2mp - 1$, and $2m - 1$ of these evidently being capable of being made unipartite; the remainder, $2mp - 2m$, *i. e.* $(p - 1) 2m$, will be the number of bipartites to be obtained*:

$$2m \cdot (p - 1) = \frac{p - 1}{2} \times 4m;$$

$\frac{p-1}{2}$ denotes the total number of cyclothemes to modulus p ; $4m$, as will be presently shown, the number of lines or syzygies in the *Table of position*.

To fix our ideas let the modulus be 4×3 , and let A, B, C be three parts:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 \\ b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4 \\ c_1 c_2 c_3 c_4 \end{array} \right\} \text{their constituents respectively.}$$

Give a *fixed* order to the constituents of each part, then each of them may be taken in four positions; thus A may be written

$$\begin{array}{l} a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 \\ a_2 a_3 a_4 a_1 \\ a_3 a_2 a_1 a_2 \\ a_4 a_1 a_2 a_3 \end{array}$$

Assume some particular position for each, as, for instance,

$$\begin{array}{l} a_1 b_1 c_1 \\ a_2 b_2 c_2 \\ a_3 b_3 c_3 \\ a_4 b_4 c_4 \end{array}$$

and read off by coupling the first and third vertical places of

* In general, if there be π parts of μ terms each, and $\mu\pi$ be even, the number of bipartite synthemes is $(\pi - 1)\mu$, as is easily shown from dividing the whole number of bipartite duads by the semi-modulus.

each antecedent with the second and fourth respectively of each consequent; we have accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 \cdot b_2 \cdot b_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot c_1 \cdot a_2 \\ a_3 \cdot b_4 \cdot b_3 \cdot c_4 \cdot c_3 \cdot a_4. \end{aligned}$$

It is apparent that the same combinations will recur if any two contiguous parts revolve simultaneously through two steps; or in other words, that $A_r \cdot B_s = A_{r+2} \cdot B_{s+2}$, where μ is any number, odd or even.

Symbolically speaking, therefore, as regards our table of position, $r : s = r + 2 : s + 2$, or more generally,

$$= r + 2 \pm 4i : s + 2 \pm 4i.$$

So that

1 : 1 = 3 : 3	2 : 1 = 4 : 3
1 : 2 = 3 : 4	2 : 2 = 4 : 4
1 : 3 = 3 : 1	2 : 3 = 4 : 1
1 : 4 = 3 : 2	2 : 4 = 4 : 2.

There are therefore no more than eight independent un-equivalent permutations to every pair of parts. Now inspect the following table of position :—

1 . 1 . 1	2 . 1 . 2
1 . 2 . 3	2 . 2 . 4
1 . 3 . 2	2 . 3 . 1
1 . 4 . 4	2 . 4 . 3

It will be seen that in the first and second, second and third, third and first places, all the eight independent permutations occur under different *names*; the law of formation of such and similar tables will be explained in due time; enough for our present object to see how, by means of this table, we are able to obtain the bipartite syntheses to the given modulus 4×3 ; the number according to our formula is $2 \times 4 \times \frac{3-1}{2} = 8$, and they may be denoted symbolically as follows:—

$$(\dot{A} \cdot B \cdot \dot{C}) \left(1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 4 \cdot 4 \right. \\ \left. + 2 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 4 + 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \right).$$

Each of the eight terms connected by the sign of + gives a distinct syntheme; *ex. gr.* let us operate on

$$\dot{A} \cdot B \cdot \dot{C} \times (2 \cdot 3 \cdot 1).$$

2 . 3 . 1 denotes $2 \cdot 3 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 2$.

2 . 3 gives rise to $2 \cdot \overline{3 + 1} + \overline{2 + 2} \cdot \overline{3 + 3}$
 $= 2 \cdot 4 + 4 \cdot 2.$

3 . 1 gives rise to $3 \cdot \overline{1 + 1} + \overline{3 + 2} \cdot \overline{1 + 3}$
 $= 3 \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 4.$

1 . 2 gives rise to $1 \cdot \overline{2 + 1} + \overline{1 + 2} \cdot \overline{2 + 3}$
 $= 1 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 1.$

The syntheme in question is therefore
 $A_2 \cdot B_4 A_4 \cdot B_2 B_3 \cdot C_2 B_1 \cdot C_4 C_1 \cdot A_3 C_3 \cdot A_1$,
 and so on for all the rest, the rule being that
 $r : s = r \cdot s + 1 + r + 2 \cdot s + 3$.

Now, as before, it is evident that if we look only to contiguous terms, the above table of position may be extended to any number of odd terms, simply by repetition of the second and third figures in each syzygy; and hence the rule for obtaining the bipartite synthemes to the modulus $4 \times p$ is apparent. For instance, let $p = 7$, there will be $8 \times \frac{7-1}{2}$, i.e. 8×3 of them denoted as follows:—

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{A} \cdot \dot{B} \cdot \dot{C} \cdot \dot{D} \cdot \dot{E} \cdot \dot{F} \cdot \dot{G} \\ + \dot{A} \cdot \dot{C} \cdot \dot{E} \cdot \dot{G} \cdot \dot{B} \cdot \dot{D} \cdot \dot{F} \\ + \dot{A} \cdot \dot{E} \cdot \dot{B} \cdot \dot{F} \cdot \dot{C} \cdot \dot{G} \cdot \dot{D} \end{array} \right\} \times \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1.1.1.1.1.1.1 + 2.1.2.1.2.1.2 \\ + 1.2.3.2.3.2.3 + 2.2.4.2.4.2.4 \\ + 1.3.2.3.2.3.2 + 2.3.1.3.1.3.1 \\ + 1.4.4.4.4.4.4 + 2.4.3.4.3.4.3 \end{array} \right\}$$

As an example of the mode of development, let us take the term

$$\dot{A} \cdot \dot{E} \cdot \dot{B} \cdot \dot{F} \cdot \dot{C} \cdot \dot{G} \cdot \dot{D} \times \dot{2} \cdot \dot{4} \cdot \dot{3} \cdot \dot{4} \cdot \dot{3} \cdot \dot{4} \cdot \dot{3}$$

$$\dot{2} \cdot \dot{4} \cdot \dot{3} \cdot \dot{4} \cdot \dot{3} \cdot \dot{4} \cdot \dot{3} = (2:4, 4:3, 3:4, 4:3, 3:4, 4:3, 3:2)$$

$$= \left(\begin{array}{ccccccc} 2.1 \} & 4.4 \} & 3.1 \} & 4.4 \} & 3.1 \} & 4.4 \} & 3.3 \} \\ + 4.3 \} & + 2.2 \} & + 1.3 \} & + 2.2 \} & + 1.3 \} & + 2.2 \} & + 1.1 \} \end{array} \right)$$

$\dot{A} \cdot \dot{E} \cdot \dot{B} \cdot \dot{F} \cdot \dot{C} \cdot \dot{G} \cdot \dot{D} = A \cdot E, E \cdot B, B \cdot F, F \cdot C, C \cdot G, G \cdot D, D \cdot A$,
 and the product
 $= \left(\begin{array}{l} A_2 \cdot E_1 E_4 \cdot B_4 B_3 \cdot F_1 F_4 \cdot C_4 C_3 \cdot G_1 G_4 \cdot D_4 D_3 \cdot A_3 \\ A_4 \cdot E_3 E_2 \cdot B_2 B_1 \cdot F_3 F_2 \cdot C_2 C_1 \cdot G_3 G_2 \cdot D_2 D_1 \cdot A_1 \end{array} \right)$.

Let the modulus be 6×3 , as before, give a *fixed* cyclic order to the constituents of each part, and each will admit of being exhibited in six positions.

Write similarly as before,

$$\begin{array}{l} \dot{a}_1 \dot{b}_1 \dot{c}_1 \\ a_2 b_2 c_2 \\ a_3 b_3 c_3 \\ a_4 b_4 c_4 \\ a_5 b_5 c_5 \\ a_6 b_6 c_6 \end{array}$$

and take the odd places of each antecedent with the even places of each consequent; it will now be seen that

$$r : s = r + 2 : s + 2 = r + 4 : s + 4,$$

and the number of independent permutations is $\frac{6 \cdot 6}{3} = 2 \cdot 6$;

294 Mr. Sylvester's *Elementary Researches in the Analysis of*
 and so in general, if there be $2m$ constituents in a part, the
 number of independent permutations is $\frac{2m \cdot 2m}{\frac{m}{2}} = 4m$.

The rule for the formation of the table will be apparent on inspection. I suppose only three parts, as the rule may always be extended to any number by reiteration of the second and third terms. The table will be found to resolve itself naturally into four parts, each containing m lines.

Let $m = 1$, we have

1. 1. 1 2. 1. 2
 1. 2. 2 2. 2. 1

$m = 2$, we have

1. 1. 1 2. 1. 2
 1. 2. 3 2. 2. 4
 1. 3. 2 2. 3. 1
 1. 3. 4 2. 4. 3

$m = 3$, we have

1. 1. 1 2. 1. 2
 1. 2. 3 2. 2. 4
 1. 3. 5 2. 3. 6
 1. 4. 2 2. 4. 1
 1. 5. 4 2. 5. 3
 1. 5. 6 2. 6. 5

$m = 4$, we have

1. 1. 1 2. 1. 2
 1. 2. 3 2. 2. 4
 1. 3. 5 2. 3. 6
 1. 4. 7 2. 4. 8
 1. 5. 2 2. 5. 1
 1. 6. 4 2. 6. 3
 1. 7. 6 2. 7. 5
 1. 8. 8 2. 8. 7

So that x , going through all its values from 1 to m , the general expression for the four parts is

$$\Sigma \left(\frac{1 \cdot x \cdot 2x - 1 + 1 \cdot \overline{m + x} \cdot 2x}{+ 2 \cdot x \cdot 2x + 2 \cdot \overline{m + x} \cdot 2x - 1} \right).$$

To show the use of this formula, let us suppose that we have seven parts, each containing ten terms, the general expression for the bipartite duad syntheses is

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{A.B.C.D.E.F.G} \\ + \text{A.C.E.G.B.D.F} \\ + \text{A.E.B.F.C.G.D} \end{array} \right\} \times \Sigma \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overline{1.x.2x-1.x.2x-1.x.2x-1} \\ + \overline{2.x.2x.x.2x.x.2x} \\ + \overline{1.5+x.2x.5+x.2x.5+x.2x} \\ + \overline{2.5+x.2x-1.5+x.2x-1.5+x.2x-1} \end{array} \right\}$$

Make, for example, $x = 3$, one of the syntheses in question out of the twelve corresponding to this value will be

$$A \cdot C \cdot E \cdot G \cdot B \cdot D \cdot F \times 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 6 \cdot 3 \cdot 6 \cdot 3 \cdot 6.$$

Here

$$A \cdot C \cdot E \cdot G \cdot B \cdot D \cdot F = A \cdot C \cdot C \cdot E \cdot E \cdot G \cdot G \cdot B \cdot B \cdot D \cdot D \cdot F \cdot F \cdot A$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{2} \cdot 3 \cdot 6 \cdot 3 \cdot 6 \cdot 3 \cdot 6 = \\ & = \left. \begin{array}{l} 2.4 \\ + 4.6 \\ + 6.8 \\ + 8.10 \\ + 10.2 \end{array} \right\} \left. \begin{array}{l} 3.7 \\ + 5.9 \\ + 7.1 \\ + 9.3 \\ + 1.5 \end{array} \right\} \left. \begin{array}{l} 6.4 \\ + 8.6 \\ + 10.8 \\ + 2.10 \\ + 4.2 \end{array} \right\} \left. \begin{array}{l} 3.7 \\ + 5.9 \\ + 7.1 \\ + 9.3 \\ + 1.5 \end{array} \right\} \left. \begin{array}{l} 6.4 \\ + 8.6 \\ + 10.8 \\ + 2.10 \\ + 4.2 \end{array} \right\} \left. \begin{array}{l} 3.7 \\ + 5.9 \\ + 7.1 \\ + 9.3 \\ + 1.5 \end{array} \right\} \left. \begin{array}{l} 6.3 \\ + 8.5 \\ + 10.7 \\ + 2.9 \\ + 4.1 \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and the product

$$\begin{aligned} & = A_2 \cdot C_4 \cdot C_3 \cdot E_7 \cdot E_6 \cdot G_4 \cdot G_3 \cdot B_7 \cdot B_6 \cdot D_4 \cdot D_3 \cdot F_7 \cdot F_6 \cdot A_3 \\ & \quad A_4 \cdot C_6 \cdot C_5 \cdot E_9 \cdot E_8 \cdot G_6 \cdot G_5 \cdot B_9 \cdot B_8 \cdot D_6 \cdot D_5 \cdot F_9 \cdot F_8 \cdot A_9, \\ & \quad \quad \quad \&c. \quad \quad \quad \&c. \quad \quad \quad \&c. \end{aligned}$$

To *prove* the rule for the table of formation, it will be sufficient to show that no two contiguous duads ever contain the same or *equivalent* permutations; the equation of equivalence it will be remembered is $r : s = r + 2i \pm 2m : s + 2i \pm 2m$. Now, as regards the first and second terms, it is manifest that $1 : x$ cannot be equivalent, either to $1 : x'$ nor to $2 : x$, nor to $2 \cdot x'$, where x' is any number differing from x .

Similarly, as regards the last and first term, $x : 1$ cannot be equivalent to $x' : 1$, nor to $x : 2$, nor to $x' : 2$; therefore there is no danger as far as the first term is concerned, either as antecedent or consequent.

Again, it is clear that $x : 2x - 1$ cannot interfere with $x' : 2x'$, nor $m + x \cdot 2x$ with $m + x' : 2x' - 1$; neither can $2x - 1 : x$ with $2x' : x'$, nor $2x : m + x$ with $2x' - 1 : m + x'$.

Again, if possible, let $x : 2x - 1 = m + x' : 2x' - 1$;

$$\begin{aligned} \text{then} \quad & m + x' - x = 2i \\ & \text{and } 2x' - 2x = 2i, \\ & \therefore 2m = 2i, \\ & \text{or } m = i, \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible, since $+i$ is the difference between two indices, each less than m .

Similarly, $m + x : 2x$ cannot $= x' : 2x'$, and *vice versa* with the terms changed.

$$\begin{aligned} & 2x : m + x \text{ cannot } = 2x' : x', \\ \text{and} \quad & 2x - 1 : x \text{ cannot } = 2x' - 1 : m + x', \end{aligned}$$

which proves the rule for the table of formation.

So much for the bipartite duad syntheses. As regards the unipartite syntheses little need be said, for every part may

be treated as a separate system, and as each will produce an equal number of syntheses, these being taken one with another, will furnish just as many unipartite syntheses of the whole system as there are syntheses due to each part. Thus then the synthemetic resolution of the modulus $2m \times p$ may be made to depend on the synthemization of $2m$ and the cyclothemization of p . This has been already shown (whatever m may be) for the case of p being a prime number; but I proceed now to extend the rule to the more general case of p being any number whatever.

[To be continued.]

XLV. Notices respecting New Books.

An Inquiry into the Nature of the Simple Bodies of Chemistry. By DAVID LOW, F.R.S.E., Professor of Agriculture in the University of Edinburgh.

FIAT experimentum, says Bacon, but the author of this work on a subject fundamentally experimental, says *fiat hypothesis*, and he has accordingly produced a work which may be considered as a caricature of the ancient doctrine of sulphur, salt and mercury; a more correct title to Professor Low's work would have been, Experiment exploded, or Fancy versus Fact. Dr. Brown may now hide his diminished head; he merely attempted to prove, and to do so by experiment, that one element was convertible into another; but Professor Low, without detailing a single experiment, either good, bad, or indifferent, has arrived at the following conclusions:—"I propose," he says, "to show, that we are not entitled to regard these bodies as elementary or simple, because we have been unable to overcome the affinities of their constituent parts; that they cannot be separated, as natural products, from the bodies which we know to be compound; and that all the phænomena of chemical actions may be equally explained, by assuming the existence of three simple bodies, or two, or one, as of any greater number."—*Preface*, p. 1. He then proceeds to describe his method of arriving at conclusions: "We have," says he, "other means of investigation than the processes of the laboratory, for conducting us to truths in science. We have induction and analogy, without which even experiment would fail to conduct us to the discovery of natural laws;" and yet with the aid of these perfect conductors, our Professor, as proved by the passage just before quoted, has not determined, which he might as well have done, whether there exist "three simple bodies, or two or one."

Our headlong Professor, by a flourish of his goose-quill, then proceeds in a manner which we really know not how to describe as less than impertinent, to demolish the opinion of Sir H. Davy on the subject of chemical elements.

The Professor says, that Davy, having examined iodine with "rigid care," and "finding it to resist all the agents which he employed to decompose it, pronounced it to be a simple body, according, as he